No. 89-1341

(3)

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
APR 6 1990
JOSEPH F. SPANIOL, JR.
CLERK

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1989

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ,

Petitioner,

vs.

TRANSAMERICAN NATURAL GAS CORP. and GHR ENERGY CORP., *et al.*,

Respondents.

Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

REPLY BRIEF FOR PETITIONER

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ
Petitioner, Pro Se
1517 Garcia Street
Laredo, Texas 78040
(512) 723-6925

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

10180
Lutz Appellate Printers, Inc. • NJ (201) 257-6850 • (800) 3 APPEAL • NY (212) 840-4640 • MA (617) 542-1114 DC (202) 783-7288 • PA (215) 925-6500 • USA (800) 5 APPEAL

8 pp

QUESTION PRESENTED

Whether the lower courts will be permitted to continue as anti-women-segregationist courts — and as controlled courts by the power corporations like Respondent.

IN ORAL ARGUMENT

It is that with the overwhelming preponderance of evidence within Petitioner's Brief, the Oral Argument before the Court would be a repetition — but Petitioner is ready to approach the Court in Oral Argument at the order of the Court.

No. 89-1341

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1989

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ,

Petitioner,

vs.

TRANSAMERICAN NATURAL GAS CORP. and GHR ENERGY CORP., *et al.*,

Respondents.

Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

REPLY BRIEF FOR PETITIONER

Before The Honorable Court:

Petitioner, Maria Graciela Ramirez as *Pro Se,* approaches the Court with the Reply Brief, based on the preponderance of

evidence presented within Petitioner's initial Brief.

It is that Petitioner has encountered with two major barriers of injustices before the state and federal courts (1) the anti-woman-segregationist courts, and (2) the controlled courts by the power corporations, like Respondent, thus the rights of Petitioner are held in bondage by the lower courts as Petitioner approaches the High Court.

STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION

Cases in courts of appeal reviewed by the Supreme Court within 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1).

STATEMENT OF FACTS

It is that Petitioner received one booklet of Respondent's Brief on March 31, 1990.

Respondent's Brief does not contain an answer to Petitioner's Brief — as Respondent's Brief contains the same command orders to the Court, that have been submitted by Respondent to the lower courts which order the courts to defraud Petitioner of her rights to a fair hearing and fair trial, and the lower courts have all moved on the orders of Respondent.

Within Respondent's Brief there appear the following statements —

Page 2(1), Respondent states that — "Respondent is unsure of what relief Petitioner, Maria Graciela Ramirez (hereinafter referred to as 'Petitioner'), is requesting, but to the extent a response is necessary to protect the rights of Respondent, Respondent opposes the granting of any damages, claims or other relief to the Petitioner."

(a) Respondent as Debtor, Defendant, Plaintiff, Appellee, and now Respondent, has always used the same excuse of not understanding Petitioner's testimonies, and the lower courts have ruled in favor of Respondent.

It is that Petitioner is fluent in the national language of English, and the presentations of Petitioner before the courts are very clear and to the point, and if Respondent and the lower courts do not understand the national language of English, there are remedial English classes offered all over the nation.

Page 2(2), Respondent states that " — the Supreme Court of the United States of America is not the Court with proper jurisdiction to hear this matter — ."

(a) It is that Respondent has decided to advise the Court what is and what is not the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Page 2A, Respondent states that — "Petitioner has successfuly pled and disposed of all claims and amounts owed by Respondent — ".

(a) How "successfully" has Petitioner pled and "disposed of all claims and amounts owned by Respondent" when under the participation and orders of Respondent, the lower courts have virtually gagged Petitioner from presenting testimonies within a fair hearing, have been instrumental in taking Petitioner's property by force and aggression, have participated in terrorizing Petitioner and threatened with bodily harm, and such is documented.

(b) It is that the Bankruptcy Committee moved to allow Petitioner's claim relief, but Respondent moved in conspiracies with the Bankruptcy judge to defraud Petitioner of such Claim

Relief by conspiring to use an ORDER signed by the Bankruptcy Court judge and presented by Respondents, to defraud Petitioner of such Claim Relief. (*See* Petitioner's Brief, Appendix C, page 7a.)

Page 2(3), Respondent states that — "If Petitioner files additional pleadings which clarify the relief sought, Respondent retains the right to respond accordingly."

(a) It is that Petitioner has clarified the "relief sought" with manifested evidence, and is ready to present further binding evidence if necessary.

(b) It is that Respondent does not "retain the right to respond accordingly" to Petitioner's Reply Brief. Respondent has the right to "respond" to Petitioner's Brief, but refused to present an answer, by moving instead with a command order to the Court.

It is that the inferior presentation of Respondent's Brief before the Court, is an open insult to any court in the nation.

CONCLUSION

Petitioner Maria pleads to the Court to Rule upon the merits of the manifested evidence presented by Petitioner within Petitioner's Brief — and thus, to bring to an end the inhuman eleven years of "justice denied" by the state and federal courts controlled by Respondent, and bring to an end the severe injustices and sufferings imposed upon Petitioner by Respondent.

It is that not only is Petitioner entitled to the Relief Damages from Respondent — but, within the laws of equal rights of the nation, is entitled to the public restitution of the rights of Petitioner, so unjustly and inhumanly denied by state and federal courts, along the years.

It is that the preponderance of evidence presented by

Petitioner before the Court, and the evading of an answer by Respondent, so as to conceal the frauds and injustices committed upon Petitioner — gives rise to a ruling in favor of Petitioner.

It is that power corporations have long controlled the courts of the nation, so as to defraud their victims of their property, by having the conspirator courts defraud them of their rights.

Respectfully submitted,

MARIA GRACIELA RAMIREZ
Petitioner Pro Se